

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

TA

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/973,018	03/25/98	LEIJON	M 70558-2/8240

 MM12/1105

WATSON COLE GRINDLE WATSON  
1400 K STREET N W  
SUITE 1000  
WASHINGTON DC 20005-2477

 ENAD.E

EXAMINER

2834

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

DATE MAILED: 3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. <b>08/973,018</b>	Applicant(s) <b>Leijon et al.</b>
	Examiner <b>Enad, Elvin</b>	Group Art Unit <b>2834</b>

Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9-21-99 and 11-23-99.

This action is **FINAL**.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

#### Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) 1-10, 13-18, 20-34, 37-41, and 44-50 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) 33 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) 1-10, 13-18, 20-32, 34, 37-41, and 44-50 is/are allowed.

Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.

Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is  approved  disapproved.

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

All  Some\*  None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

received.

received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.

received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_.

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

#### Attachment(s)

Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 10

Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2834

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Objections***

1. Claim 33 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. The limitations set forth in the claims do not further limit the hydrogenerator plant but instead define a procedure outside the structure of the plant.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. Claims 1, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, line 6, the limitation pertaining to the solid insulation covering surrounding the conductors and in “electrical contact” with the uninsulated strand...is confusing since the solid insulation is nonconductive.

In regard to claims 24 and 25, the claims are indefinite, lacking positive limitation.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2834

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-10,13-18,20-32,34,37-41 and 44-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Titus (USP 5,550,410) in view of Elton et al. (USP 4,853,565) and further in view of Takaoka et al. (USP 5,094,703).

Titus discloses the claimed invention except for a teaching of having the generator with windings comprising a plurality of insulated conductive elements and an at least one uninsulated conductive elements. Titus discloses a gas turbine electrical power generating apparatus comprising of a plurality of combustion turbine generators. As seen in figure 1, the turbine **16** is directly coupled to the generator **20** by shaft **18** and can be operated at speeds higher than 3,600 RPM in order to obtain greater turbine energy conversion efficiency.

Elton et al. teach that it is known to provide a semiconducting layer in the insulation of a conductor and to connect that layer to a fixed potential in order to provide an equipotential surface on the conductor preventing corona discharge around the conductors.

Takaoka et al., as seen in figures 7,8,10 and 11 teach having a stranded conductor for an electrical cable comprising a combination of uninsulated stranded conductor and an insulated stranded conductor.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided a semiconducting layer around the conductors of Titus since such a

Art Unit: 2834

modification would prevent corona discharge, as disclosed by Elton et al. Moreover, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have the windings of Elton et al. comprised of insulated and uninsulated electrical conductor strands since such a modification according to Takaoka et al. would reduce the amount of insulation needed and the number of electrical connections required in the end windings.

5. In regard to forming the semiconducting layer with the same coefficient of thermal expansion as that of the insulation layer, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have formed these layers with similar coefficients since it was known in the art that the expansion rate of the two layers would be the same and this is desirable in order to prevent cracking of the insulation and wear between the two.

6. With regard to claims 38,39 and 44-49, note that Elton et al. teach that it is known to provide a semiconducting layer in the insulation of a conductor and to connect that layer to a fixed potential in order to provide an equipotential surface on the conductor preventing corona discharge around the conductors.

***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed on September 21, 1999, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's arguments that Elton fails to suggest or teach the use of his cable in a dynamo-electric machine, applicant's attention is directed to the abstract

Art Unit: 2834

whereby Elton suggests that his insulated conductor may be used in windings of dynamoelectric machine. Moreover, Elton also provide a solid insulating system, element **106** as seen in figure 1.

*Conclusion*

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for response to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the date of this action. In the event a first response is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event will the statutory period for response expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elvin Enad whose telephone number is (703) 308-7619. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00AM to 4:00PM.

10. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nestor Ramirez, can be reached on (703) 308-1371. The fax phone number for this Tech Center is (703) 305-3431(32).

Art Unit: 2834

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.



Elvin Enad  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2834  
11.04.99